



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/661,766

09/15/2003

Robert Kindermann

7271

29177 7590 06/20/2008  
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLP  
P.O. BOX 1135  
CHICAGO, IL 60690

EXAMINER

IBRAHIM, MOHAMED

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2144

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Continuation Sheet**

Applicant argues,

1. Shimoosawa does not teach inserting an address assigned to the second subscriber into the object.

Shimoosawa discloses a comprehensive invention that among other things, teaches transferring mechanism for an e-mail data. As one of ordinary skill of the art would readily appreciate, any time a transferring of email or data in general is transferred from one device to another; an address of the second device is required in order to transfer data to it. Shimoosawa discloses various ways of determining the destination address. By analyzing the content of the e-mail including appended files, attributes of the content as well as the header information (see col. 1 line 62-col. 2 line 33 also see col.7 lines 19-25 and 56-67). According Applicant's specification starting page 1 line 29 to page 2 line 7, the term "object" is a general term may include any text in a document. Thus since the term "object" can be any item in content of e-mail; it is interpreted to mean either the e-mail itself, the attribute of the e-mail, the header or the appended file. Thus the claim language interpreted in light of the specification is still very broad and therefore Shimoosawa still meets the scope of the claimed invention as currently presented.

2. Reading out or determining the address assigned to the second subscriber.

Shimoosawa indeed discloses determining the assigned address of the second subscriber. In column 5 of Shimoosawa, it clear states that when an e-mail is received, the header portion of the email is analyzed to obtain the sender's ID. Namely the determination unit carries out a matching process and when a match is found by the determination unit, the determination unit reads out the destination information corresponding to the sender's ID as well as the attribute of the contents (see col. 7 lines 19-30). The process of determining doesn't necessarily have to be in the same sequence as Applicants. Rather the requirement for meeting this limitation, the reference needs to disclose mechanism for determining the assigned address of the second subscriber which Shimoosawa clearly discloses. Therefore, Shimoosawa still meets the scope of the claimed limitation as currently recited.

### 3. Establishing connection between first and second subscriber.

Shimoosawa clearly discloses establishing connection between first subscriber and second subscriber. Among other things, Shimoosawa invention discloses a connection process which permits first device to establish connection with second device. In the system of Shimoosawa plurality of devices are connected which receive data from each other. In order to this to occur, a communication path must be established for the data transfer to take place from two distinct devices (see fig. 7 item "connection process" and col. 7 lines 9-17). Thus, Shimoosawa indeed discloses establishing connection and therefore, still meets the scope of the claimed limitations as currently presented.

Again, it is the Examiner's position that Applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of Applicant's disclosed invention in manner, which distinguishes over the prior art. As it is Applicant's right to continue to claim as broadly as possible their invention. It is also the Examiner's right to continue to interpret the claim language as broadly as possible. It is the Examiner's position that the detailed functionality that allows for Applicant's invention to overcome the prior art used in the rejection, fails to differentiate in detail how these features are unique. It is advised that, in order to further expedite the prosecution of the application in response to this action, Applicant should amend the base claims to describe in more narrow detail the true distinguishing features of Applicant's claim invention (i.e. Applicant's specification, page 5 lines 10-31 and page 6 line 21 through page 7 line 12).

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144